

Am
E. Poles
Lucas
not listed

Abba Hillel Silver
Moshe Shertok
Chaim Weizmann

Before the United Nations

OCTOBER, 1947

In October 1947, when the report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine was considered by the Ad Hoc Committee on Palestine of the United Nations General Assembly, the Jewish position was set forth by representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Statements were made by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, on October 2; by Moshe Shertok, head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, on October 17; and by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, on October 18. The text of each of these statements follows.

Abba Hillel Silver:

MR. CHAIRMAN and Members of the Committee: The Jewish Agency for Palestine, which I have the honor to represent, is appreciative of the privilege which this Committee of the United Nations General Assembly has extended to it to be represented at its deliberations and to express its views on the report which the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine has submitted.

We have read the report with the deepest interest and the closest attention, and we are prepared to make our observations on it. We are greatly impressed with the earnest and conscientious labors which the eleven members of the Special Committee devoted to their task and which are reflected in the comprehensive and impressive document before us.

It was good to have a committee of neutrals examine the Palestine problem afresh in an effort to arrive at a solution which would be morally justifiable and politically sound. We share entirely the view expressed in the report that the "opinions of members of an international committee who represent various civilizations and schools of thought, and have approached the question from different angles, may be of some value."

The Jewish Agency availed itself of the invitation extended to it by the Special Committee to present its case. We were happy to make available to the committee whatever information it desired of us, to answer any question, and frankly to share our thinking with it. We regarded it as an inescapable obligation to cooperate to the fullest extent with the United Nations, which had this grave international problem presented to it and which assumed the responsibility for formulating a decision on the future government of Palestine.

In this connection we find it necessary to point to a circumstance to which the report itself draws special attention—namely, the failure of the Arab Higher Committee to cooperate with the committee. The chairman of the United Nations Special Committee, during the hearings in Jerusalem, made an appeal by radio for the full cooperation of all parties. The Special Committee also addressed a letter directly to the Arab Higher Committee regretting the decision of the latter not to cooperate and repeating the Special Committee's invitation for full cooperation. In reply Mr. Jamal Husseini, vice chairman

of the Arab Higher Committee, wrote that the Committee found no reason to reverse the previous decision to abstain from collaboration.

One is at a loss to understand why the Arab Higher Committee was unwilling to present its case to the Special Committee of the United Nations. The Jewish Agency likewise had been subjected to the strains and disappointments of the numerous Palestine inquiries which preceded it. Having repeatedly refused the invitation to present its case, why does the Arab Higher Committee come now to ask "justice and equity" at the hands of the United Nations, whose authority it had flouted and whose competence to define the form of the future government of Palestine the Arab spokesman on Monday categorically denied?

The same spokesman treated us to an historic improvisation on the origin of the Jewish people and on the history of Palestine. History may not be an exact science but it certainly is not a story out of the *Arabian Nights*. There are certain facts which do not yield to wishful thinking. Thus the canard that the Jews of Western Europe are descendant not from Israel of old but from a tribe of Khazars in Russia is a relatively recent invention and was popularized in the racial mythologies of our day by those whose political motivations are clearly transparent. One could say with some amusement that the Arabs of Palestine would be among the last people on earth to wish to engage in genealogical research.

WHEN THE Allies liberated Palestine in 1917 along with other parts of the former Ottoman Empire, Palestine was a segment of a Turkish province. There was no politically or culturally distinct or distinguishable Arab nation in that province. There never had been. The Arabs who conquered Palestine in the seventh century of the common era held sway over that country, which contained a very mixed and heterogeneous population for 437 years between 634 and 1071 A.D.—437 years out of more than 3,000 years of recorded history in Palestine. After 1071 the country was conquered by various non-Arab peoples, such as the Seljuks, the Kurds, the Crusaders, the Egyptian Mamelukes, and finally by the Ottoman Turks.

By the time the Arabs conquered Palestine in 634 A.D., the Jewish people had already completed nearly two thousand years of national history in that country, during which time they created a civilization which decidedly influenced the course of mankind, gave rise both to Judaism and Christianity, produced the Bible and brought forth prophets, saints and spiritual leaders who are venerated not only by Judaism, but by Christianity and Islam as well.

"In the twelve centuries or more that have passed since the Arab conquest," reads the report of the Royal Commission of 1937, "Palestine had virtually dropped out of history. . . . In economics and in politics Palestine lay outside the main stream of the world's life. In the realm of thought, in science or in letters it made no contribution to modern civilization."

The very identity of Palestine as a unit of human society is an achievement of Jewish history. The country lost its separate character with the Jewish dispersion and only assumed a specific role in history when the Palestine mandate was ratified. The mandate acknowledged this history by setting Palestine in a distinct and separate context in relation to the Arab world. "I am persuaded," declared President Wilson on March 3, 1919, "that the Allied nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish Commonwealth."

SPEAKING IN the House of Lords on June 27, 1923, Lord Milner, who called himself "a strong supporter of the pro-Arab policy," stated:

"Palestine can never be regarded as a country on the same footing as the other Arab countries. You cannot ignore all history and tradition in the matter . . . and the future of Palestine cannot possibly be left to be determined by the temporary impressions and feelings of the Arab majority in the country in the present day."

When the Palestine mandate therefore recognized "the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine," it was only stating a fact that was universally acknowledged through the ages. And when it gave international recognition to the grounds for reconstituting the Jewish national home in that country—an act which Field Marshal Smuts, member of the War Cabinet which issued the Balfour Declaration, called "one of the greatest acts of history"—it was only reaffirming the fact that the Jewish people had never surrendered the hope of national restoration in its ancestral homeland. For the Jews, Palestine was not merely a place of sacred shrines as to Christians and Moslems, but the

home of their exiled people, the land of their national destiny, and throughout the dark centuries of persecution and wandering there were continuous efforts to return to it.

Concerning the Arab economic grievances which were aired here the other day, we wish only to refer to the report of the United Nations Special Committee which examined all of them, as well as to the relevant chapters in the Royal Commission report of 1937, to show how utterly groundless they are. These reports, as well as the memorandum of the Palestine Government which was submitted to the Special Committee of the United Nations—a document which can hardly be charged with pro-Jewish bias—conclusively prove that the Palestine Arabs benefited considerably and directly from Jewish development in the economic, financial and social spheres.

WE MUST take note, too, of the interesting contrast which the Arab spokesman attempted to draw between the terroristic acts of the Arabs of Palestine in 1936-39—acts which were never condemned or repudiated by any responsible Arab spokesman—and the regrettable acts of some dissident Jewish groups in Palestine today, which the official bodies of Palestine Jewry have most severely condemned.

"It has been officially admitted that in their several uprisings against the British in Palestine," stated the Arab spokesman, "the Arabs ordinarily fought face to face as noble men." As illustrative of this nobility, permit me to quote the statement of Sir John Chancellor, the High Commissioner of Palestine, on the Arab riots there in 1929:

"I have learned with horror of the atrocious acts committed by bodies of ruthless and bloodthirsty evil-doers, of savage murder perpetrated upon defenseless members of the Jewish population regardless of age or sex, accompanied as at Hebron by acts of unspeakable savagery, of the burning of farms and houses in town and country, and of the looting and destruction of property. These crimes have brought upon their authors the execration of all civilized peoples throughout the world."

In commenting upon the riots of 1936, the report of the Palestine Royal Commission has this to say:

"There were similar assaults upon the persons and property of the Jews, conducted with the same reckless ferocity [as in 1929]. Women and children were not spared."

Before making our observations on the report itself, may we be permitted to comment on the statement which

was made at the beginning of your deliberations by Mr. Arthur Creech Jones on behalf of His Majesty's Government?

It was the United Kingdom Government which requested that the question of Palestine be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly. It was His Majesty's Government which asked the Assembly to make recommendations under Article 10 of the Charter for the future government of Palestine.

IN MAKING these far-reaching requests, with which the United Nations complied, the United Kingdom surely must have had in mind not the thought of ultimately imposing its own solution on the United Nations, but the hope that this great international body, approaching the problem anew and without bias, might find a solution which, while not fully acceptable to everyone, would nevertheless represent the collective wisdom and judgment of the nations of the world and would have behind it such weight of authority that His Majesty's Government would be prepared to accept it and cooperate in its implementation.

Surely such loyal cooperation on the part of member nations is presupposed when any international problem is considered by the United Nations. Otherwise His Majesty's Government might just as well have announced six months ago what it declared the other day. Why were six critical months lost, during which time the situation in Palestine was permitted to deteriorate most gravely? And why was all the apparatus of the United Nations invoked to investigate and to recommend a settlement of the problem if there was no intention to accept and to participate in the implementation of such a settlement?

Sir Alexander Cadogan, at the fifty-second meeting of the First Committee of the General Assembly, stated: "All we say—and I made this reservation the other day—is that we shall not have the sole responsibility for enforcing a solution which is not accepted by both parties and which we cannot reconcile with our conscience." But we observe that His Majesty's Government is not being asked to accept a sole responsibility. The report of the Special Committee clearly recommends that if so desired, one or more members of the United Nations shall be invited to assist in the administering of the country along with the present mandatory power.

The statement of Mr. Creech Jones seems to go beyond that of Sir Alexander Cadogan's and implies that His Majesty's Government not only does not wish to assume sole responsibility for implementing the report, but reserves to itself the right of refusing any cooperation in

implementing the final decision of the United Nations if, in its judgment, it does not comply with its own criteria of justice and with its own preferred technique of implementation.

One questions whether in taking such a position—if we have understood the position correctly—the United Kingdom is helping to solve this difficult problem and whether its course will enhance the authority and prestige of the United Nations which has assumed responsibility over the Palestine question. It is clear to everyone that the solution of this problem represents a vital challenge to the United Nations and a crucial test of its future effectiveness.

In view of His Majesty's Government's reluctance to impose a policy by force of arms, a policy which would have behind it the sanction of the community of nations, one may be pardoned for inquiring why His Majesty's Government has not hesitated to employ in recent years a military force of 100,000 men, along with its navy and its air force, to impose by force a policy on Palestine which no international body has approved, which is contrary to the purposes and provisions of the mandate, and which has been thrice disapproved by international bodies.

It would have been more helpful if the statement of His Majesty's Government had been more revealing. Surely it must be clear to everyone that no settlement of the Palestine problem is possible without some enforcement.

The Palestine problem is not at all unique in this regard. The report of your Special Committee correctly states: "Taking into account the fact that devising a solution which will be fully acceptable to both Jews and Arabs seems to be utterly impossible, the prospect of imposing a solution on them would be the basic condition of any recommended proposal."

IT WAS the realization that such an Arab-Jewish agreement was impossible that prompted Mr. Bevin to turn the problem over to the United Nations. Mr. Creech Jones' declaration, therefore, that "the United Kingdom Government are ready to assume the responsibility for giving effect to any plan on which agreement is reached between the Arabs and the Jews" is very singular indeed and does not advance the solution at all.

It may be pertinent to recall that the principle of partition on which the majority report of the Committee is based was first projected by the all-British Royal Commission in 1937. At that time the British Government accepted that recommendation in principle and declared:

"In supporting a solution of the Palestine problem

by means of partition, His Majesty's Government are much impressed by the advantages which it offers to the Arabs and the Jews. The Arabs would obtain their national independence and thus be enabled to cooperate on an equal footing with the Arabs of neighboring countries in the cause of Arab unity and progress. They would be finally delivered from all fear of Jewish domination. . . . On the other hand, partition would secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home and relieve it from any possibility of its being subjected in the future to Arab rule. It would convert the Jewish National Home into a Jewish State with full control over immigration. . . . Above all, fear and suspicion would be replaced by a sense of confidence and security, and both peoples would obtain, in the words of the Commission, 'the inestimable boon of peace'."

CONFRONTED AS we now are by the latest expression of His Majesty's Government, we cannot help but reflect upon the course which has been followed by successive British Governments during the past decade. In 1937 the British Government appointed a Royal Commission to study the Palestine problem, which, after an exhaustive study, recommended partition as a solution. After an initial approval of the plan, the British Government wound up by rejecting it and promulgated in its stead the White Paper policy of 1939 which was in complete contradiction to the basic recommendation of the Royal Commission.

In 1945 the British Government invited the American Government to join in a two-nation inquiry into the Palestine problem with a view to its solution. This committee submitted unanimous recommendations proposing this time not partition, but a unitary state. It called for the abrogation of the White Paper policy, including its racial land law, the early admission of 100,000 Jews, continued Jewish immigration thereafter, and the faithful implementation of the provisions of the mandate. The British Government rejected the recommendations of this committee likewise and wound up by putting forward the Morrison and Bevin proposals which were diametrically opposed in substance and in spirit to the report of the Anglo-American Committee.

Finally, in 1947 the British Government proposed another examination of the Palestine problem, this time by the United Nations. As a result, a commission was appointed consisting of the representatives of eleven neutral nations. This committee has now submitted a report which recommends a plan of partition coupled with economic union. But this report seems no more acceptable to His Majesty's Government than the two earlier

reports. It has indicated no support of this latest report and offers in its stead—nothing.

The failure, however, of the United Kingdom Government to give the United Nations a measure of guidance and support, and its announced intention of an early withdrawal from Palestine, which we welcome, makes it more imperative than ever that the General Assembly should proceed with the work before it with utmost dispatch. As early as last April it was realized in the special session of the Assembly that there was great urgency in the matter. Certainly that urgency for action and decision has been intensified by all that has transpired since.

THE JEWISH AGENCY, in making this preliminary comment on the report itself, wishes to indicate at the outset its full approval of all but one of the eleven unanimous recommendations made by the committee. On the sixth recommendation, of which it does not disapprove, it would like to make this observation. The sixth recommendation calls upon the General Assembly "to undertake immediately the initiation and execution of an international arrangement whereby the problem of the distressed European Jews, of whom approximately 250,000 are in assembly centers, will be dealt with as a matter of extreme urgency for the alleviation of their plight and of the Palestine problem."

It will be recalled that the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry likewise recommended that efforts be made immediately to find new homes for these displaced persons. In making this recommendation the Anglo-American Committee stated: "We have to report that such information as we received about countries other than Palestine gave no hope of substantial assistance in finding homes for Jews wishing or impelled to leave Europe."

The position in this respect has remained completely unchanged. The recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee has remained a dead letter. Our unfortunate refugees are still languishing in the displaced persons' camps, facing a third winter after the termination of the war. The report of your Special Committee refers to the "intense urge" of these distressed persons to be allowed to go to Palestine.

The "intense urge" of the Jewish displaced persons to proceed to Palestine and the refusal of most of them to go anywhere else springs not only from their realization that the prospects of their admission to other countries are slight in the extreme, and even then only of a very limited scope. It springs pre-eminently from the fact that Palestine offers to them that which they need most and cannot find anywhere else: the chance of a

real home, the prospect of a life in congenial surroundings, the insurance of permanency.

All the longing of these uprooted people for a life of peace and dignity, for a normal and secure existence, finds expression in this "intense urge" to go to Palestine. What more overwhelming and tragic evidence of this urge is required than the persistent and desperate attempts of these men, women and children to reach the shores of the Jewish national home from where they are forcibly turned back—in the case of the *Exodus* 1947, back to Germany. And if it be countered that mere desire does not create a right, a complete answer is that that desire was the basis for the creation of the right by the Balfour Declaration and League of Nations mandate.

That desire was recognized as morally so compelling that it led the victorious Allies in the first World War to establish solemn international commitments guaranteeing the legal right of Jews to go to Palestine.

The Jewish Agency strongly hopes that the nations of the world will welcome those among the displaced persons who wish to emigrate to other lands. The Jewish Agency never contemplated that any displaced person should be forced to go to Palestine. But surely, to compel those Jewish refugees, many of whom have close family ties with Palestine, to go against their will to other lands and to deny them the right to go to the Jewish national home would be most unjust and unkind and would be bitterly resented.

The twelfth recommendation of the committee, which was not unanimously accepted by the committee, reads: "It is recommended that in the appraisal of the Palestine question, it be accepted as incontrovertible that any solution for Palestine cannot be considered as a solution of the Jewish problem in general." We are at a loss to understand the meaning of this recommendation—actually not a recommendation but a mere postulate. The "Jewish problem in general" is not a problem of Jewish immigration or of refugees. It is the age-old problem of Jewish national homelessness.

There is but one solution to this problem, a national home. This was the basic Jewish problem which was faced by the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, and to which the proper solution was given—the reconstitution of the national home of the Jewish people in Palestine.

WITHOUT ATTEMPTING at this stage a detailed analysis of the solution recommended by the minority of three members of the Special Committee, we must state at once that we find it wholly unacceptable, even as a basis for discussion. This minority report proposes the establishment of an independent Federal State of

Palestine, consisting of what are described as an Arab and a Jewish "State," though they are, in fact, little more than semi-autonomous cantons or provinces.

It is obvious that under the constitutional provisions envisaged in this recommendation, Palestine would become in effect an Arab State with two Jewish enclaves, in which the Jews would be frozen in the position of a permanent minority of the population of the Federal State. Under the proposed constitution the Jewish province would not have control over immigration even within the narrow confines of its own borders. Nor would it have control over its own fiscal policies. Not only with regard to the crucial question of immigration, but also with regard to many other matters of fundamental importance, the ultimate power of decision will rest with the Arab majority of the proposed Federal State.

The proposal is a variant of the federal scheme put forward last year by His Majesty's Government, generally known as the Morrison Plan, which was rejected at the time both by Jews and Arabs, as well as by the Government of the United States. The plan entails for the Jews all the disadvantages of partition—and a very bad partition geographically—without the compensating advantages of a real partition: statehood, independence and free immigration.

AS REGARDS the majority report we wish to make the following observations. These proposals are those of the Committee. Needless to say, they are not the proposals of the Jewish Agency which, in fact, were ruled out by the Committee. They do not represent satisfaction of the rights of the Jewish people. They are a serious attenuation of these rights. At the hearings of your Committee we fully defined these rights and their justification. I will not here impose upon you by restating them.

Partition clearly was never contemplated by the Balfour Declaration or the mandate. It was intended that Palestine, the whole of Palestine, shall ultimately become a Jewish State. This is the clear testimony of Mr. Lloyd George, who was the British Prime Minister at the time of the issuance of the Declaration. The land referred to as Palestine in the Declaration included what is now Trans-Jordan. The Royal Commission of 1937 declared that "the field in which the Jewish national home was to be established was understood at the time of the Balfour Declaration to be the whole of historic Palestine." That area has already been partitioned.

The first partitioning of Palestine took place in 1922 when Trans-Jordan, representing three-quarters of the original area of Palestine, was cut off and has since

been set up by the British as an Arab kingdom. Thus, one Arab state has already been carved out of the area assigned to the Jewish national home. It is now proposed to carve a second Arab state out of the remainder of the country. In other words, the Jewish national home is now to be confined to less than one-eighth of the territory originally set aside for it.

This is a sacrifice which the Jewish people should not be asked to make. The legitimate national aspirations of the Arab peoples have been fully satisfied. President Truman, in his letter of October 28, 1946, to the King of Saudi Arabia, calls attention to this fact: "I am happy to note," he writes, "that most of the liberated peoples [of the Near East] are now citizens of independent countries. The Jewish national home, however, has not yet been fully developed."

The Arabs possess today independent monarchies in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Egypt, Iraq and Trans-Jordan, and independent republics in Syria and Lebanon. A population of 17,000,000 in Arab Asia occupies an area of 1,290,000 square miles, enormously rich in resources and potentialities. This area, which formerly belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and which, together with Egypt, was liberated by the Allied nations, includes all the centers which are primarily associated in history with Arab and Moslem traditions. Palestine, the historic home of the Jewish people, which the nations of the world after the last war declared to be the Jewish national home, is, after the loss of Trans-Jordan, only 10,000 square miles in extent, and it is now proposed, in the Majority Report, further to reduce the area of the Jewish national home by almost one-half.

It is not our intention at this time to enter into a detailed discussion of the many territorial provisions in the proposals of the Majority Report. But we feel constrained to point out at least two features which are open to most serious objections. The Majority Report eliminates western Galilee—that is, most of Galilee—from the Jewish State. The Peel Commission included western Galilee in the Jewish State. For reasons which we shall endeavor to explain more fully at a later stage, we regard the proposed exclusion of western Galilee as an unjustified and a particularly grievous handicap to the development of the Jewish State.

Under the terms of the majority proposal, the City of Jerusalem is set up as a separate government unit. We would not question the propriety of placing the old City of Jerusalem, which contains the holy places, as well as the holy shrines, which may be outside the walls of the old city, in the custody of an international trustee. But outside the old city a modern new city has grown up which contains a compact Jewish section of approxi-

mately 90,000 inhabitants. This new city includes the central national, religious and educational institutions of the Jewish people of Palestine.

Excluding all of Jerusalem from the Jewish State would be a particularly severe blow. Jerusalem holds a unique place in Jewish life and religious traditions. It is the ancient capital of the Jewish nation and the symbol throughout the ages of Jewish nationhood. The undefeated resolve of our people to be reconstituted as a nation in the land of Israel was epitomized in the solemn vow of the Palmist and of the exiled people throughout the ages: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." We strongly urge that the Jewish section of modern Jerusalem, outside the walls, be included in the Jewish State.

There are other modifications which we will take up at a later stage of these discussions.

TO RETURN to the basic solution of partition proposed by the Special Committee: It entails, as we have said, a very heavy sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people. But if such a sacrifice is made the inexorable condition of an immediate and final solution, we would be prepared to assume the responsibility for recommending acquiescence to the supreme organs of our movement, subject, of course, to further discussion of the constitution and territorial provisions which we assume will take place in the course of these sessions.

We would be prepared to do so because the proposal makes possible the immediate re-establishment of the Jewish State, an ideal for which our people ceaselessly strove through the centuries, and because it ensures immediate and continuing Jewish immigration which, as events have demonstrated, is possible only under a Jewish State. We would do so also as our contribution to the solution of a grave international problem and as evidence of our willingness to join with the community of nations in an effort to bring peace at last to the troubled land which is precious to the heart of mankind.

We are impressed with the recommendation in the report of an economic union between the two states. We approve of the conclusion reached by the committee that "in view of the limited area and resources of Palestine, it is essential that, to the extent feasible, and consistent with the creation of two independent states, the economic unity of the country should be preserved."

This appears to us to be a progressive and statesmanlike conception of great promise. The Jewish Agency is prepared to accept this proposal of an economic union. It should, however, be understood that this economic union, while it would bestow some benefits on the Jew-

ish State, would also impose grave sacrifices. The acceptable limit of these sacrifices is, in principle, clear: the Jewish State must have in its own hands those instruments of financing and economic control that are necessary to carry out large-scale Jewish immigration and the related economic development. The Jewish State must have independent access to those world sources of capital and supplies that are indispensable for the accomplishment of these purposes.

The Majority Report provides, in effect, for a large subsidy from the Jewish to the Arab State, through equal sharing by the two states of the net revenues from customs and joint services. This subsidy would be a very heavy one in relation to the national income. The Jewish Agency would, however, be prepared to assume this burden as one of its sacrifices designed to find a way out of the present intolerable impasse.

WE MEAN to be good neighbors, not only to the Arab State of Palestine, but to the Arab States throughout the Middle East. And certainly we mean scrupulously to respect the equal rights of the Arab population in the free and democratic Jewish State. With the removal of political friction and bitterness which we hope will eventually result from the setting up of these two independent states, each people master in its own home, it should be possible to usher in an era of progress and regeneration which would be a boon to all the peoples in that important part of the world. What the Jewish people has already achieved in Palestine in a short time and in the face of enormous obstacles is indicative of what it hopes to do in the future along with, and in fullest cooperation with, all of its neighbors.

Neighborliness, however, is a two-sided affair. Sincerely and without reservations we bring the offer of peace and friendship. If it is met in the same spirit, rich and abundant blessings will redound to all. If not, we shall be compelled to do what any people must do under such circumstances, defend our rights to the utmost. We have 'built a nation in Palestine. That nation now demands its independence. It will not be dislodged. Its national status will not be denied. We are asked to make an enormous sacrifice to attain that which, if uninterfered with, we would have attained long ago. In sadness, and most reluctantly, we are prepared to make this sacrifice. Beyond it we cannot, we will not go.

THE REPORT recommends that "during the transitional period the authority entrusted with the task of administering Palestine and preparing it for independence shall be responsible to the United Nations." In view of the statement of His Majesty's Government it is not clear now which will be this authority. We favor an international authority under the United Nations to supervise and insure the implementation of its decisions.

Above all, we urge that the transitional period be as brief as possible. A period of two years is, in our judgment, considerably longer than is necessary or desirable. It is to be assumed that the transfer of the powers and functions of administration to the two peoples in their respective states would not take place at the end of the transitional period, but would be inaugurated immediately and consummated as rapidly as possible. The Jewish people of Palestine stands ready to assume immediately all responsibilities which the establishment of the Jewish State will involve.

We agree with the report that "whatever the solution, enforcement measures on an extensive scale may be necessary for some time." The Jewish people hopes that the transition from the present status of the country to the new status of two independent states, will be attended by a minimum of friction and conflict. Once the boundaries are defined and the states established by the United Nations they will be entitled to have their territorial integrity and sovereign rights respected and protected as fully as all other nations which are covenanted to peaceful relations under the Charter.

All members of the United Nations, whether in the neighborhood of Palestine or elsewhere, who are bound by the principles of the Charter, will be expected to respect the rights of these new states, under pain of being condemned as aggressors and subjected to international sanctions. Moreover, we assume that in the constitution of whatever military or police force may be required during the transitional period, full use will be made of the trained manpower available in Palestine which will be prepared to offer its services to the United Nations to maintain law and order.

The Jewish State, when it is established, will respect the sovereignty of its neighbor states as fully as it will defend its own. The Jewish people in Palestine is prepared to defend itself. It is not impressed by idle threats. A people that has survived the accumulated fury of the centuries, faced powerful empires in a bitter battle for survival, and during the last war saw hundreds of thousands of its sons fighting for freedom in all the liberat-

ing armies of the Allied nations—while the head of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee was broadcasting Nazi propaganda from Berlin and congratulating Hitler on his African victories over the Allies—such a people will not be intimidated. Nor, we are confident, will this great international body which is earnestly wrestling with this tremendously difficult problem and which is seeking a just and equitable solution, be terrorized into surrendering its high mandate.

We recall with satisfaction that similar threats uttered by the same parties during the first special session did not influence the resolution of the Assembly. Nor was the Special Committee impressed by these threats during its hearings. We hope that these same threats will not influence this great deliberative body which must be guided by principles of truth and justice—the underlying principles of its Charter.

The Jewish people in Palestine, I repeat, will be prepared to defend itself. It will welcome, of course, whatever support can properly be given to it by the United Nations or its members, pursuant to the decisions of the United Nations.

In this connection we must take note of the announcement made by the representative of the United Kingdom that its forces may not be available to the United Nations during the transitional period, and may be subject to early withdrawal from Palestine. In that event, in order to avoid the creation of a dangerous vacuum which might affect public security, the Jewish people of Palestine will provide without delay the necessary effectives to maintain public security within their country.

MR. CHAIRMAN and members of this Committee: With this United Nations report we have reached one of the important crossroads of history. The course which will be followed will be fraught with destiny for all, the Jews, the Arabs and the United Nations. We hope that it will be a course of wisdom, justice and courage. The Jewish people hopefully await the decision of this body.

Twenty-five years ago a similar international organization recognized the historic claims of the Jewish people, sanctioned our program and set us firmly on the road of realization. We were not then regarded as intruders or invaders, not even by the foremost leaders and spokesmen of the Arab world, but as a people returning home after a long sad exile. The world approved and acclaimed the return of Israel to its ancient homeland. The statesmen of the world faced the tragic problem of Jewish national homelessness and they set about to solve it.

The Jewish people was confirmed in its right to rebuild its national life in its historic home. It eagerly seized the long hoped-for opportunity and proceeded to rebuild that ancient land of Israel in a manner which evoked the admiration of the whole world. It has made the wilderness blossom as the rose. Surely this great international body, surveying this faithful and fruitful work, will wish to see that work continued, that undertaking advanced, that hope of the centuries consummated. It will be a noble achievement which will redound to the everlasting glory of this world organization. It will be a supreme act of international justice.

Moshe Shertok:

MR. CHAIRMAN and Honorable Members of the Committee:

The Jewish Agency for Palestine appears here before you as a body representing Jews throughout the world who are organized to defend the interests of the Jewish people as a whole in regard to Palestine. It speaks for the large mass of the Jews who are already in Palestine but unlike the Arab Higher Committee its constituency is not confined to that country; it is world-wide.

Yet the Jewish Agency finds itself at a serious disadvantage in relation to its Arab counterpart. We alone represent the Jewish people in the face of the fifty-seven nations here assembled. Not so the Arabs of Palestine. They have brothers in your very midst with whom they are united by the closest bonds of kinship and identity of outlook. Quite a number of delegates have upheld in the debate the justice of our claims. We are deeply grateful to them, though none of them, quite naturally, could identify himself with the Jewish cause. But when the Arab states spoke, most of them twice and three times, their utterances were charged with all the fury and passion of a party to the dispute. It was the Arabs of Palestine themselves who have spoken through their mouthpiece for an aggregate total of more hours than one would care to count. We, the Jewish representatives, sat here silent in the face of this unceasing and seemingly inexhaustible barrage of political attack and of factual misrepresentation, unable to refute the charge, to expose the untruth, nail down the irrelevancy as they continued day after day. We appreciate the opportunity now accorded to us to speak out after the conclusion of the debate, yet we cannot but draw attention to the disproportion between the existing facilities for attack and for defense, which is of course due to no ill-will but is the direct outcome of the anomaly of our position.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this disparity in status between the representation of the Arab and of the Jewish case at this Committee — still more obvious at the Assembly from which we are completely debarred — should serve to bring out more forcibly the real scope and significance of the issue with which the United Nations is faced. The two focal points of that issue are these: first, that Palestine is the only country in which the Jewish people can hope to attain a secure home and a national status on equal foot-

ing with other independent nations; and second, that the Arabs of Palestine are not a people in themselves but a fraction of a much larger unit, amply secure in the possession of vast areas and in the enjoyment of full-fledged sovereignty and independence.

That issue is not new. The victors in World War I faced it squarely. They were given the lead by Great Britain in the Balfour Declaration and in the promises to the Arabs. They proceeded to reconcile and synthesize the two main trends of Middle Eastern settlement: the opening of a prospect for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine and the paving of the way for Arab independence in other liberated parts of the Ottoman Empire. This dualism was clearly reflected in the international instruments of the time: the purpose of the Mandates for Syria and Iraq was to prepare the countries for independence; the primary purpose of the Palestine Mandate was to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

An attempt has been made here to invalidate the part of the settlement concerning Palestine and to extend to Palestine the validity of the other part. The learned delegate for Pakistan has treated the Committee to a formidable display of erudition on the promises made to the Arabs and the attitude of their recipients to the Balfour Declaration. According to him, the late King Hussein was uncompromisingly opposed to the Declaration. He told the Committee that in an article published in his official organ in Mecca his late Majesty called upon the Arabs to welcome Jews not only to Palestine but to all Arab countries and he asked: Would the Jews now claim that King Hussein had agreed to the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Syria or Iraq merely because he said they should be welcomed there?

THE question as put, Mr. Chairman, is pertinent on the basis of the premise set, but the premise itself is false and therefore the question does not arise.

The learned delegate for Pakistan appears to have overquoted the late King Hussein. I have that memorable article in *Al-Qibla* here in front of me in photostat copy, and I find no reference in it to the idea that Jewish settlers should be welcomed to Arab countries outside Palestine. On the contrary, Jewish immigration is represented in that

article as an exclusively Palestinian phenomenon, and as a highly commendable phenomenon at that. For, wrote the late King, "the root cause (of that phenomenon) could not escape those endowed with deeper insight; they know that that country (meaning Palestine) is a sacred and beloved homeland for its original sons, *abna'ih-i-atiyyin*, and he speaks elsewhere in the article of the return of these exiles to their homeland which was conferring, according to him, great benefits on their Arab neighbors.

King Hussein's son, the illustrious Emir and later King Feisal, was even more explicit in his endorsement of Balfour Declaration policy. The famous agreement which he concluded with Dr. Weizmann dated January 3rd, 1919, speaks throughout of the Arab State and Palestine as existing side by side, the latter by no means included in the former. It provides for measures "to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants upon the land." In a proviso to the Agreement Feisal stipulated that he would consider it binding only if his claims outside Palestine were fully met. The presence of six Arab delegations in this hall is evidence how amply that condition has now been fulfilled.

The representative of Pakistan further told the Committee that in appearing before the Paris Peace Conference Feisal claimed the whole of Syria, including Palestine. Those were his words—"including Palestine." But the official record available of Feisal's appearance before the Council of Five on February 6th, 1919, states: "Palestine, for its universal character, he left on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, he asked for the independence of the Arab areas enumerated in his memorandum."

It is significant that a few days later, on February 13th, the Council of Five received a Syrian Delegation which included the present Syrian Prime Minister, Jamil Mardam Bey. That delegation claimed the inclusion of Palestine in Syria as an autonomous province, but it welcomed the settlement of Jews in Palestine and freely conceded that "if they form the majority there, they will be the rulers."

This argument about historical accuracy is no mere quibble, nor is the establishment of historical truth on the subject of mere academic value. The facts stated are directly relevant to the present controversy and to the problem of its eventual settlement. They show that in a great historic moment bold vision and the acceptance of Britain's pledge as final led Arab leaders to contemplate reconciliation between Arab and Jewish political aims. They envisaged the future in terms of mutual adjustment rather than of one-sided domination.

Another relevant aspect of the historical and legal analysis of the case concerns the international validity of

the Palestinian settlement which resulted from World War I.

AGAIN the representative of Pakistan, in his very able championship of the Arab cause, sought to overshadow the issue by a host of contentious arguments about the nature of promises made to King Hussein and the validity of various subsidiary and interpretative documents, some of which, like the Hogarth Message, were unearthed and officially published for the first time only twenty-two years after their delivery, when the British Government cast about for documentary material to justify its change of policy by way of post factum rationalization. But no amount of legalistic casuistry can avail to undermine the overriding authority of the Palestine Mandate. The McMahon promises and the Hogarth Message are at best instruments regulating the relations between Great Britain and a certain Arab dynasty. They never received any international sanction. The Palestine Mandate, on the other hand, was "an open covenant, openly arrived at" between the fifty-two nations which then formed the League of Nations and was publicly endorsed by the United States of America. The Mandate as is well known incorporated the Balfour Declaration which then became an international instrument; it recognized the historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine; it provided for the reconstitution of the Jewish National Home; it guaranteed to the Jewish people special facilities for immigration and settlement throughout Palestine, subject only to the limitation of not worsening the lot of existing inhabitants.

Under Article 80 of the Charter, the Mandate, as long as it has not been replaced by any other instrument, is part of the law of the United Nations. The delegations of the Arab States were fully aware of the implications and of the purpose of Article 80, but their strenuous efforts to resist its passage at San Francisco were unsuccessful.

Actually, as many as 47 out of the present 57 members of the United Nations were members of the League of Nations. Among the 47 are also Egypt and Iraq. The delegate for Egypt declared during the Special Session of the Assembly that when his country joined the League of Nations it made a reservation regarding the Palestine Mandate. A scrutiny of the records of the League of Nations revealed no trace of such a reservation. Iraq joined the League under a declaration that it would fulfil all the obligations which membership of the League involved; this certainly included respect of the Palestine Mandate.

Invoking the right of possession, the delegate for Pakistan and others argued that Palestine was not Great Britain's property for her to promise it to the Jews. But, for that matter, nor were Syria or Iraq Great Britain's, and

yet her promises in their regard were accepted as binding pledges. The Arabs, it was argued, had fought on the side of the Allies in World War I. But so did the Jews, their volunteer legions having come to Palestine from England, United States, Canada, Argentine, and from Palestine itself, to take part in the country's liberation. It is an established fact that Palestine Arabs had no share whatsoever in the fighting. In the final analysis it was the exertions, sacrifices and final victory of Allied armies which resulted in the liberation of Palestine and the Arab provinces. It is to that victory that most independent Arab States of today owe their existence. If they accept the boon of independence which fell into their lap like a ripe plum, they must accept its price. The pledge to grant the Arabs independence in large areas and the setting aside of Palestine for the Jewish people were organic parts of the same war settlement.

JUST as the independence of Arab countries was won for them by the Allies in World War I, so it was Allied victory again in World War II which saved that independence from the danger of new submergence under Nazi-German enslavement and Fascist-Italian colonization. To that second victory of our days the Arab States contributed nothing. None of them fought and most of them joined formally in the war only in the nick of time, when all the fighting was practically over, just in order to qualify for membership of the United Nations.

The honorable head of the Iraqi delegation made here two astounding revelations: first, that in 1942, Iraq had offered to send troops to fight in North Africa, and second, that the offer was rejected owing to the intervention of the Jewish Agency. May I say that I happened to be responsible throughout the war for the Jewish Agency's contacts and cooperation with British military authorities and I have heard here of Iraq's offer for the very first time. If both parts of the Iraqi delegate's statement are to be accepted as of equal authenticity, then the fact that the second is so manifestly absurd and fantastic must raise serious doubts as to the accuracy of the first.

The only community in the Middle East which really fought in the war and which had its heart in the fighting were the Jews of Palestine. Their signal contribution to the Allied war effort was rewarded by a regime in Palestine which inflicted untold suffering on the Jewish survivors of the European tragedy. Yet the Arab States, having reaped without sowing, firmly entrenched behind the Charter, are now invoking it as a bulwark against the claim of the Jewish people for a place in the family of nations. "The principles of the Charter for which millions gave their lives," said here the delegate for Syria, little perturbed by

the fact that there was not a single Syrian, not one, among the fallen millions.

Here again the delegations of the Arab States were very ably seconded by the learned delegate for Pakistan who by dint of extensive quoting sought to set up the Charter as an insuperable barrier to the establishment of a Jewish State even in a part of Palestine. But quoting the Charter is not the monopoly of the Arab side. It all depends on who quotes and for what purpose. Take the very opening words of the Charter: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind . . ." Mr. Chairman, we appeal to this Committee to agree that the "scourge of war" signified for the Jewish people wholesale extermination and that the "untold sorrow to mankind" embraces the continued agony of hundreds of thousands of the survivors. We believe that there is no effective way of saving succeeding Jewish generations from the scourge of extermination and the sorrow of homelessness except by setting up a Jewish State in Palestine. This is our determination and we invoke the Charter in our support.

Next comes the reaffirmation of "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." Here again, Mr. Chairman, we claim the application of a Charter principle to the case of the Jewish people. We believe that the dignity and worth of a Jew as a human person cannot fully assert itself, nor can Jewish men and women attain equal rights with others, unless the people to which they belong is placed on a footing of complete equality with other peoples — that is, unless its national existence is secured and unless it is enabled to enjoy, at least in one corner on the face of the globe which it can call its own, the dignity and effective protection of statehood. Furthermore, we believe that the Jews of Palestine are already a nation, deserving and entitled to equal rights with other nations, large and small. All this is before we reach Article 1 of the Charter which has been the particular victim of quotation. What are the operative phrases in that article? We claim the relevancy to our case of the phrase "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." And we certainly invoke "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." We claim to be a people and, as such, entitled to self-determination. We are prepared to adjust our right of self-determination to the right of others but adjustment must be mutual. We are not prepared to give up our right or to concede that the right of others is superior to ours. And if any one would

question our title to speak as a people we would reply that this title too is a subject of self-determination, not of dictation from outside. In short, we find nothing in the the Charter to invalidate our claim. We find in it a great deal to strengthen it. We regard it as inconceivable that the justice and equality which the Charter enshrines should be destined for all mankind save the Jewish people; that for the Jewish people alone there should be no room in the world edifice erected on the graves and ruins of the last war; that it should continue henceforth as before, a homeless vagabond, cast adrift over the face of the earth.

WITH a consistency worthy of a better purpose the Arab delegates proceeded to deny that the Jews are indeed a people, or that as a people they have any particular or valid connection with Palestine. Here again a brief reference to history is unavoidable. It is granted that historical associations alone cannot decide a burning political issue of today. But it is important to realize the impact of history upon present-day realities—because historical consciousness generates a national will, the national will moves masses of men to action, action results in the creation of facts, and political facts give rise to international problems. The sequence is uninterrupted and irresistible.

It is therefore essential to realize that the connection of the Jewish people with Palestine is the central fact of the whole situation. Chronological data were cited here, mostly false, to prove the historical aspect of the Arab case. But the issue cannot be appraised by reference to mere chronology. It is the organic facts of history that matter. The Jewish people was born in Palestine and shaped by it. The country gave birth to no other people either before or after. It is untrue that the Jews all left Palestine in the first century. Their mass settlement in Palestine persisted till the seventh century despite persecutions, expulsions and the ruthless crushing of rebellions. Nor is it true that the Jews have ever turned their backs on Palestine. Their efforts to return have never ceased and the present phase of resettlement which began in the late seventies of the last century is but the last link in the chain. Zionism did not start with the Balfour Declaration. The Declaration was the product, not the origin of Zionism. The Jewish State idea is not a crazy whim of recent origin. It is the dream of centuries of Jewish martyrdom, the vision of Jews in all generations, the practical ideal which animated the first returning pioneers of seventy years ago. Both the anomalous position of the Jewish people in the diaspora and the remedy urged by Zionism for it are products of history and the whole problem cannot be understood outside its context.

It is an untruth and an irrelevancy to suggest that the Jews of Europe are no Jews at all but descendants of a Mongolian tribe. In support of this fantastic theory Arab spokesmen have repeatedly invoked the Jewish Encyclopedia. Members of the Committee were invited to consult the volume in the library. If they do that they will find that this factual assertion of Arab delegates is no better founded than many others — it is simply untrue. The article on the Khazars in Volume IV of that Encyclopedia does not contain a word from which it could be deduced that Southern Russia was the origin of European Jewry. It actually says that the great mass of the Khazars after their subjection by the Russians remained in their native country — meaning that they did not migrate to the North or to the West. All research points to the conclusion that East European Jewry originated in Western and Central Europe, not in Southeastern Europe.

The whole pseudo-scientific discussion of ethnic origins is moreover perfectly irrelevant. Politics must grapple with facts, not with theories which lead nowhere. Hitler and the Mufti were not in the least bothered about the origin of the Jews whose doom they decreed. To them they were just Jews and they let them go — and die — at that. Nor are the Jews themselves impressed by the discoveries made by others, always to suit their anti-Jewish purpose, as to what they really are so long as their consciousness and their dire need, and so the attitude of the world towards them, all remain unchanged. Surely it would be absurd, for example, to inquire, for the purpose of political discussion, into the racial origin of some of the Arab delegates here so long as they are conscious of being Arab and act as such. That is what they are entitled to. The Arab spokesmen would be well advised at least in this respect to accept historic and psychological facts as part of the political background—as an immutable part of the political background—and to drop once and for all this genealogical nonsense.

But then the Arabs retreat to a second line of attack and proceed to conjure up a non-existent distinction between Judaism and Zionism. Organized Zionists, they say, are but a small minority and most Jews are not Zionists. The usual double trick of false statistics is here resorted to of first quoting an absurdly low figure for the adherents of a movement and then working it out as a percentage of the total in which their own wives and children are included. One wonders how many organized and fee-paying members the so-called National Bloc in Syria had through all the years of its existence. Yet it always laid claim to the exclusive representation of the Syrian people. It is indeed singular how little understanding a group of leaders of a national movement such as that with which we have here to join issue, cares to show for the central position occupied

by another national movement in the life of its own people. Zionism is the quintessence of Jewish national life and striving. There is no source of national will or energy, no centre of national creative activity, which operates in Jewish life outside the Zionist movement, that is, the Jewish movement centered on Palestine. That movement is nothing but the Jewish people organized in a struggle for its better future. There are large numbers of Jews who are Zionist at heart though not in name. There are very few who are militantly anti-Zionist. The publication of the majority report called forth a remarkable manifestation of Jewish unity. Jewish organizations of widely divergent political denominations in this country have all rallied to the support of the Jewish Agency in its present claim for immediate statehood. Zionism is today universally accepted as a decisive political factor in Jewish life. Nor is there any doubt in our mind what type of Jew commands the respect of true patriots in any nation, including all the Arab peoples.

One charge thrown against us in this Committee I will not attempt to refute because it refutes itself. I refer to the charge that Zionism is identical in ideology and in method with Nazism. Addressing myself to the Iraqi and Syrian delegates who dwell on this most unprofitable subject I would merely say this. It was not we who before the war attended as honored guests the Nuremberg rallies. Nor was it we who during the war were interned as allies of the Nazis. Our turn to be detained by the British Administration came at a later stage, after we had helped to beat down the enemy.

Another theme on which Arab spokesmen continue to harp, despite conclusive rebuttals, and which they would likewise be extremely well advised to abandon, is what I might call the Spain argument. If the Jewish claim to Palestine after such long separation is to be accepted, why not concede the right of the Arabs to return to Spain and what would the world come to if past possession, even in remote antiquity, became the guiding principle for the determination of the right of sovereignty? The analogy is not merely absurd. It defeats its own purpose and proves exactly the contrary. It merely serves to accentuate the uniqueness of the historical phenomenon of Jewish attachment to Palestine. Do Arab women anywhere tell their children about ancient Arab glories in Spain? Do they kindle in their hearts the hope of returning there? Are there any circles of Arab youth studying the geography of Spain, singing its songs and learning the crafts useful in Spain in preparation for immigrating into that country? Has the world ever witnessed boatloads of homeless Arabs desperately trying against overwhelming odds to reach the shores of Spain? The question of the Arab claim to Spain does not arise because, for want of any practical need,

Arab attachment to Spain simply does not exist. The reason is that the Arabs are all settled and perfectly at home in their countries whereas the Jew is still striving to regain his own.

WHILE I am on the point of spurious analogies, may I revert to that remarkable speech—the first of two—made by the delegate for Pakistan. Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan was quite liberal in the use of the analogical method in relation to my country. He deprecated it only when it affected his own. He drew a parallel between the Jewish orphans in the camps of Europe and the young victims of the recent tragic events in Pakistan. He indicated many similarities but omitted from his comparison the most fundamental point of difference: the Pakistan children, for all their distress, are at home — in their own country and among their own people. Jewish children in the camps of Europe are homeless not merely in the literal sense but in the deeper historic sense. The second analogy was between the Jewish position in Palestine and the British position in India: if the claim of the Jews in Palestine is based on the benefits they have conferred on the Arab population, he argued, then the claim of the British to stay on in India would have been equally valid. The inference, though perhaps not quite intended, or not intended at all, was nevertheless self-evident: just as the British are quitting so should the Jews quit. The comparison does flagrant violence to patent facts. It would require an inordinately long stretch of imagination to make the comparison real. The British nation would have had to have been born in India, driven out of it by force, unable to regain a firm foothold in any other country and drawn to it by its persisting attachment to return to its native land. The Englishmen coming to India would have had to be coming not as viceroys, as high officials or as army officers but as tillers of the soil, as road builders, as factory workers. They would have had to be working physically in the broiling sun, wrestling derelict areas from the wilderness of sand, stone and swamp with their own bare hands as we have done, rearing their children to stay in India and work there planting trees to give them shade. Only then would the comparison have made sense.

In actual fact, we have never based our claim on the benefits we are conferring on others. We consider ourselves under no obligation to confer benefits. The only obligation we accept is that we should not make things worse for the existing inhabitants. We are no missionaries, or philanthropists. We come to seek our own salvation though we are most eager to help our neighbors and extremely pleased if we can do so. But the benefits we are conferring in the process of our own self-rehabilitation are an incon-

trovertible fact, acknowledged freely or grudgingly, as the case may be, by friendly and unfriendly observers, including the delegate for Pakistan himself. Moreover, those benefits are an inevitable outcome of the process. The reason is simple. You cannot bring into a country a large volume of initiative, skill, scientific knowledge and capital without the new wealth you create percolating to your environment and without the example you set being followed by others. You cannot stem the tide of prosperity; it inundates the entire economic sphere. Because it is inevitable, the process is bound to continue — there is simply no other way of doing the job. The more Jews you bring in, the greater the amount of development you do, the wider are the opportunities for your neighbors. It is inherent in the nature of things and it cannot be changed.

MUCH has been made of the fact that in Jewish enterprises, as a rule, Jewish labor is employed. That is certainly the case and I would not overstress the fact that for every single Jew employed as a wage earner in the Arab economy there are at least 100 Arabs — not 10 or 20 or 50 but 100! — employed by Jews. The main criterion by which the value of Jewish development to the Arab population stands and falls is not how many Arabs are employed by Jews, but whether the total volume of employment available to the Arabs rises or drops as its result. Now one of the most conspicuous trends in Palestine's economic life is the constant increase of Arab employment in the measure as Jewish development is progressing. Apart from direct and positive evidence, our contention is proved by the enormous increase of the Arab population coupled with the steady rise in its standard of life, by the fact that the increase is greater in areas of Jewish development than elsewhere as well as by the fact that there is no Arab emigration from Palestine, but on the contrary an influx of cheap labor from the neighboring countries into Palestine. When I lived 40 years ago in a certain Arab village between Jerusalem and Nablus, many of the more enterprising villagers of that neighborhood were emigrating to America while some of the stay-at-homes used to walk on foot in the harvest season to Transjordan to eke out their incomes. Now there is no Arab emigration to America and as to Transjordan the trend has been reversed: Transjordanians come to Palestine for work, and not the other way around. If you ask the villagers even in that area which is remote from Jewish settlement, what happened to account for the change they will say that there is more work in the country and that it is better paid. And if you ask why, the answer will be: "It is the Jews." Gravitation towards higher prosperity areas is an inevitable phenomenon of economic life and the problem

for the Jewish State will be how to cope with the infiltration of lowly paid labor from outside rather than what to do with Arabs thrown out of work inside the territory.

But, it is alleged, the Jews are driving the Arabs off their land, and in the Jewish State, according to the expressed conviction of the delegate for Pakistan, the process will gather momentum. Have the Jews not got unlimited funds at their disposal? Is not all Jewish land nationally owned? Are the Jews not prohibited from employing Arab labor at all? A horrifying prospect is thus conjured up of dispossessed and workless Arabs streaming out of a Jewish State in quest of work in distant lands. But the point is that no dispossession is taking place at all. With the progress of farming, Arab peasants are becoming more rooted in the soil, not less. Their stake in the soil of Palestine, in the shape of properly built houses, of trees, of plantations, of livestock and of implements is increasing. An abrupt reversal of the process is unthinkable in the light of contrary experience in the past. The distorted picture is the result either of false briefing or of a complete misreading of the processes actually at work.

TO BEGIN WITH, only less than one-half of the Jewish land is nationally owned. The rest is private property. On nationally owned land the principle is not merely of Jewish labor but as a rule of self-labor—that is, all work is done by the settlers themselves, without resorting to hired labor — so that the question of employing Arabs simply does not arise. On privately owned land and particularly on orange plantations, where hired labor is the rule, thousands and thousands of Arabs are employed. But the main point is the total extent of Jewish land purchase. With all their fabulous resources, and with all the facilities they had under the Mandate—not under the White Paper—the Jews have, so far, managed to acquire less than seven percent of the land area of Palestine. A large part, a very large part, of the land acquired by the Jews had not been withdrawn from Arab farming at all. It had originally been given up as uncultivable and had to be reclaimed at a heavy cost. It now represents a net addition to the country's agricultural resources. On the other hand, certain marginal lands previously uncultivated have here and there been brought under cultivation by the Arabs themselves, to take advantage of the higher demand for produce created by the Jewish urban market and with capital largely derived directly or indirectly from Jewish sources. The total net loss to Arab farming in terms of area has therefore been much smaller than it looks. That loss in area has been more than made up by increased productivity due to the agricultural progress which has been largely

stimulated by the Jews. Area alone is never a decisive factor in determining agricultural prosperity. The use to which the land is put is equally, if not more, important. Transition from dry to irrigated farming, for example, means at least a five-fold increase of yield and of employment. In the case of land as in the case of labor the criterion is whether the total number of Arab farmers has increased or diminished and whether their average economic level has gone up or down. By both these tests the beneficial effects of Jewish settlement on Arab farming stand vindicated. The story of Arabs rendered landless by Jewish land purchase roaming over the countryside is a myth invented for political use. It has been disproved by official inquiries and it has not a shred of evidence in its support. A steady stream of Arab laborers from the purely Arab districts and from outside of Palestine to those partly settled by Jews on land bought from Arabs is proof to the contrary. Those who sold surplus lands invested the proceeds in the development of the remainder. Productivity has risen and so has the demand for labor, I mean for Arab labor.

It has been the invariable principle of Jewish land purchase policy not to leave landless an Arab who had worked on the land acquired. We see to it that tenants, if they must be shifted, are accommodated elsewhere in farming. Peasant proprietors look after themselves and hardly ever sell outright. Nor are we interested in buying land from very small proprietors in view of the fragmentation of holdings. We buy from those with a surplus to sell and we buy only the surplus.

The reason why Jewish agricultural settlement has not only not displaced Arab farmers but has helped to raise their standards is that a three-fold process has been at work: first, reclamation of land which was considered as uncultivable; second, the discovery and use of new water resources; third, the introduction on a large scale of more valuable crops. This is the reply to the question of the delegate for Pakistan — how will Jewish immigrants be settled on the land without squeezing out the Arabs. There have been a few instances where land was bought from absentee landlords and the tenants were moved; there was no case of a village of peasant proprietors having disappeared from the map of Palestine. In the coastal plain, 150 Jewish villages have been established; not one Arab village has disappeared. All of them now prosper far more than they did before. All of them are now more populous than they were before.

Today the whole position is vitiated by the operation of the racial land law which prevents Arabs from selling and us from buying land in most parts of Palestine. The law is a dead weight alike on Jewish settlement and Arab agricultural development. In the Jewish State not only will

the self-interest of the Arabs not to sell out completely operate at least as vigorously as before, but the Jewish authorities, because more directly responsible, will be even more scrupulous in the observance of their principles. In this respect as in other aspects of the treatment by the Jewish State of its Arab minority I would not lay claim to confidence in Jewish ethical superiority. We claim no such superiority. I would merely humbly suggest that the Jews may well be trusted to take a reasonably intelligent view of their own interests. We shall be living in a glass house in the Jewish State, watched with sharp suspicion by our immediate neighbors and keenly observed by many from afar. We shall have our own hostages, so to speak, in countries near and far. We shall be most vitally interested in Arab prosperity on our own account, so that they should not undermine our standards but rather be potentially good clients for our industrial products. This is not merely our declared policy. It will be a matter of direct self-interest for us to try and raise the living standard of the Arabs up to our own level.

Above all it is important to remember that the bulk of the country's land area — 18,000,000 dunams out of a total of 26,000,000 — is today classed as uncultivable — of no use to God or man. The Arabs have no incentive to develop the largest part of that huge derelict total, and unless the Jews are given the freedom of experiment and reclamation, those large tracts scattered—over the country but particularly concentrated in certain parts—will remain for generations to come, if not forever, in the present state of stagnation. The delegate for Pakistan took strong exception to the inclusion by the Majority of the Special Committee of the Negev area in the proposed Jewish State because it is purely or predominantly Arab. But the Negev comprises 45% of the area of Palestine and yet accounts for less than 5% of its population. One might have called the Negev purely Arab even if only 100 Arabs roamed over the vast expanse. The choice as regards the Negev lies between its inclusion in the Jewish State and its intensive development through irrigation for the benefit of Jews and Arabs alike, or its dereliction in its present state.

I might here recall one curious slur passed on our work by the representative of Egypt who said that all we do in Palestine is artificial. I wonder exactly what he meant by that term and how it was intended to impress us. Go and tell our children who were born in the country that they are artificial. Tell that to the trees we have planted, to the fields we have reclaimed, to the factories in which we are working. Try and dismiss as artificial the potash plant on the Dead Sea or the power house on the Jordan. In this sense the Dam of Assuan in Egypt is artificial. So is the Tennessee Valley project. So is, in

fact, the entire magnificent civilization of this American continent, which is all the result of migration.

IF THE Jewish people had been given a proper chance, in terms of time and administrative facilities, for conducting large-scale immigration and settlement in the true spirit of the Mandate, then the whole area of Western Palestine—after the separation of Transjordan, which was originally included in the Balfour Declaration area—would in a not-too-distant future have become what we call a Jewish State, that is an independent state with a Jewish majority, and open to receive Jewish immigrants. The Jewish Agency firmly holds that this is what the Jewish people was entitled to claim and to expect and, that given favorable political conditions, what it could have achieved. But the international acceptance and the practical implementation of this program at the present stage met with admittedly formidable difficulties. The difficulties would not have been insuperable had the Mandatory persevered in its task throughout. But the defection of the Mandatory in the White Paper of 1939, its refusal to revert to the status quo ante after the war, and the apparent absence of a practicable alternative to the former Mandatory regime, such as would render possible the continuation of large-scale Jewish immigration and settlement in an undivided Palestine over a period of years, faced the Jewish Agency with the imperative necessity of seeking a short-cut to independence.

This course was dictated by compelling Jewish needs, both in Palestine and in Europe. In Palestine, the Jewish people had outgrown its tutelage. It matured in the ordeals of the pre-war Arab disturbances and of the war itself. Around it, country after country achieved independence. The Jews of Palestine, keenly conscious of having become a nation, still lacked the attributes of statehood. Their political and economic system did not fit into the surrounding pattern. Their political inferiority and defenselessness were exploited against them. They felt convinced that statehood was both urgently necessary and definitely practicable.

In Europe, on the other hand, the tragedy of the surviving Jews, combined with the refusal of the Mandatory Government to increase the arbitrary, grossly inadequate, immigration quota, created an untenable situation. The highly precarious position of the Oriental Jewish communities also became a source of grave concern. The problem of providing immediate rescue for past and potential victims of persecution added further urgency to the need for statehood.

Incidentally, the story which has been repeated here so many times probably in the hope that it will stick, about

those mysterious 30,000 Jews in Palestine anxious to go back to Germany and Austria and prevented by threats, is a complete and utter falsehood. Neither 30,000, nor 10,000, nor 3,000 nor 1,000 have registared to go back. It is a pure invention. The very idea that such a large number of people can be kept in Palestine against their will by force or threats is just fantastic.

Arab delegates, in trying to make palatable to international opinion their uncompromising attitude on the immigration issue, have sought to effect a separation between the problem of Palestine and that of homeless Jews. Let the International Refugee Organization take care of the latter, they said. How genuine this suggestion is may be judged from the fact that as far as we are aware, none of the Arab States has yet joined the I.R.O.—they are thus all parties to the prevention of its proper functioning. But the whole question of the I.R.O. is here beside the point. The separation which the Arabs advocate in this respect is as real and practicable as the separation which they have been urging between Judaism and Zionism. The issues are inseparable in life and in practical politics. The Jewish displaced persons press on Palestine, and that is a factor in international politics. The Jewish displaced persons and the Jewish people in Palestine believe that the entry of Jews into Palestine is a matter of right and not subject to Arab consent.

The highly distinguished delegate for India also accepted the idea of separation between the problems of Palestine and the Jewish D.P.'s—apparently by way of a dialectical escape from a moral predicament. She urged that countries should come forward with offers to take in refugees. She may be new to the subject, and not aware that such appeals have been made times out of number in the past and have fallen on deaf ears—or at any rate produced very meagre response. Nor may she have heard of the intense desire of these people to go to Palestine where alone they would feel that they belong.

I should like to take this opportunity to stress the frightful urgency of a provision for an immediate substantial increase of immigration to Palestine if mass suffering is to be alleviated and if tragedies are to be avoided, such as that of the *Exodus*—an event which undoubtedly shook the conscience of the world and yet so far has not produced a remedy.

Bearing all these considerations in mind, weighted down by their cumulative burden, the Jewish Agency faced the dilemma with which the Report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine confronted it.

The conclusions we reached were indicated in our opening statement. We took note of the rejection of our own plan; we took note of the unanimous recommendation that the Mandate must be terminated; we took note of the

proposal of the majority of the Committee for the partition of Palestine and the establishment in it of two states. With a heavy heart but in full consciousness of the historic responsibility which the step involved, we decided to give this plan our full consideration.

The sacrifices involved in the partition plan for the Jewish people cannot be exaggerated. It entails giving up nearly one-half of a country on the regaining of the whole of which the hopes and prayers of countless generations had centered. The blow to Jewish feeling and to the Jewish future resulting from the complete exclusion of Jerusalem from the Jewish State has already been stressed. Other areas and sites hallowed by sacred associations, districts with rich potential promise, even whole clusters of Jewish settlements representing a triumph of pioneering effort over overwhelming odds have also been excluded from the Jewish State in the proposed scheme. The Jewish Agency has definite proposals to make in regard to boundary modifications as well as on other aspects of the scheme. In view of the far-reaching effect of every aspect of the scheme on the Jewish future, the Jewish Agency trusts that it will be given full opportunity to present and defend its case at such a sub-committee or sub-committees as this Ad Hoc Committee may decide to appoint.

One basic feature of the scheme on which I might comment, is the proposed Economic Union. Our attitude to this far-reaching proposal has already been stated. But during the debate sharp criticism of the Economic Union idea was voiced by some Arab spokesmen, and sinister designs on the Arab State were imputed in this connection to the Jewish Agency. Let me make it clear, therefore, that we do not in the least regard the Economic Union as essential for the well-being of the Jewish State. Rather on the contrary, it entails a heavy burden on its finances, and some curtailment of its sovereignty, in which we would be prepared to acquiesce in order to facilitate a solution, but the prospect of which we by no means relish. We naturally consider it vital that there should be the closest possible economic ties between the two States of Palestine, but were the matter left to ourselves we would not have proposed the imposition of a compulsory Union, but would have preferred a series of purely voluntary agreements.

BUT the main target of attack against the majority scheme has been the proposed territorial settlement whereby a substantial number of Arabs is to be included in the Jewish State. But that Palestine will continue to be inhabited by Jews and Arabs we regard as a decree of history. That Arab and Jewish villages are intermingled in most parts is a physical fact which cannot be changed. It is therefore impossible to carve out a substantial area for a

Jewish State, without including a considerable number of Arabs in that area. The Jewish Agency has already stated that it regards the area proposed for the Jewish State in the majority report, with certain modifications which it proposes to urge, as constituting the indispensable minimum — a compromise proposal entailing heavy sacrifice less than which the Executive would not be prepared to recommend to the movement for acceptance, but by which, if implemented, it would be prepared to abide. This being so, may I now attempt to indicate the choice of alternatives which today lies before the United Nations?

The earliest possible grant of independence to Palestine seems now to represent a consensus of world opinion. In fact, it may be regarded as a foregone conclusion. The announcement by the mandatory power of its irrevocable decision to evacuate Palestine at an early date leaves no room for doubt in that regard. That the country will soon become independent is thus certain, and the only question is what form that independence will assume. There are only two possibilities as to the form of independence — either a unitary state or two separate states. To convert Palestine into a unitary independent state on the basis of the present composition of its population would in effect mean to constitute the whole of Palestine as an Arab state and leave the Jewish minority at the mercy of the Arab majority. It is a solution which is no solution; it has been categorically rejected by the Zionist movement with the full support of the entire Jewish people. It has rightly been dismissed in the majority report. The reasons are obvious, but it might nevertheless be of assistance to those anxious to form an objective and dispassionate opinion on the problem for me to offer some observations on the relative merits of the two alternatives.

In drawing the comparison I must deal with figures into a detailed analysis of which I cannot here enter. That can be done in the sub-committee. I would merely indicate that I assume that the Jews of Jerusalem will anyhow all opt for citizenship of the Jewish State and also that as recently indicated by the official statistician of the Palestine Government the figures of Arab natural increase which until recently were accepted as valid have been found to be somewhat exaggerated.

My comparison is therefore this. First: In the event of a unitary state, nearly 700,000 Jews will be placed in an Arab state. In the event of partition on the lines of the majority report, between 400,000 and 500,000 Arabs, rather nearer the lower limit, will be included in the Jewish State. Secondly: In the former event the entire Jewish people in Palestine will be denied self-determination. In the latter event two-thirds of the Arab population will enjoy it. Thirdly: In the former event the Jews would feel that they had been put into a death trap and

would react accordingly. They would anyhow feel crushed under the weight of an overwhelming Arab majority in Palestine, reinforced by the vast and solid mass of Arab population in the surrounding countries, all united in the Arab League. In the latter event the Arab minority in the Jewish State would find a most effective guarantee for its security in the crescent of Arab states which encompass the Jewish State on three sides. Fourthly: In the former event a highly democratic and larger minority would find itself ruled by and forced to adapt itself to a majority element with a totally different economic system and totally different social conceptions. In the latter event a smaller minority would find itself bracketed with a progressive majority whose life interest it would be to help lift the minority up to its own level. Fifthly: In the former event all Jewish immigration into Palestine would stop and the problem of the homeless Jews of Europe would reach a hopeless deadlock. In the latter event the Jewish State would offer a larger and quicker solution to the problem than it might be possible to attain by all the other alternatives put together; we are convinced in fact that it would provide a complete solution to the problem. Lastly: In the former event the Jewish people, which is a minority in every country throughout the world, will be condemned to permanent minority status also in Palestine, and its one hope of ridding itself once and for all of that scourge at least in its native land will be doomed. In the latter event all that would happen on the converse side is that the Arab people which is in an extremely fortunate position as compared with many others—in that the overwhelming majority of its members are compactly settled in countries adjacent to each other and enjoying full independence—will have a relatively small fraction placed in a minority position in an adjoining strip of territory, a minority which will forever remain united with it by innumerable economic and cultural ties.

The conclusion I would propose to draw from this comparison is too obvious to require formulation. The delegates of the Arab states and of Pakistan have invoked the solemn rights of ownership, occupation, possession and self-determination in order to deny the validity of the Jewish claim to statehood. They refuse to accept the international dispensation which constituted Palestine as a country *sui generis*, destined not merely to continue to harbor its Arab sons but also to serve as a national home for the Jewish people. But surely they must face the physical fact that Palestine can today be so divided as to make the Jews the majority in a large part of it. Why should the high principles invoked for the whole of Palestine not be made applicable to a part of it? If the idea is, as suggested by one of the Arab delegates, that you cannot break up one mandated territory, then the whole separation of

Transjordan and its constitution as an independent state is illegal. Why should not the sauce for the goose of Pakistan be the sauce for the gander of Palestine? To this the honorable delegate for Pakistan has two replies. First, that Indian Moslems are in India of old, whereas the Jews in Palestine are newcomers, and second, that in India partition came by mutual consent whereas in Palestine it is a controversial issue. The first reply can hardly be expected to impress the Jews. On the second, a very apt comment was made by the distinguished delegate for Canada. He said very rightly that consent is at least as necessary for a unitary state as for partition. May I add to this the following question: What would have happened if India had not shown the statesmanship and the wisdom of conceding Pakistan's right of secession? Is the Jewish claim to secede in a suitable part of Palestine less valid merely because the Arab leaders do not share that statesmanship and that wisdom? Is unwisdom to be accepted as a dictator?

There is, of course, the question of the relationship between the Jewish State and the neighboring Arab states. The Jews are interested in concentration, not dispersal. Once a state has been established, satisfactory to the Jews, its boundaries will be respected. But by a sheer process of endless repetition any absurdity can be made to sound plausible. Listening to the speeches of Arab delegates one may have come to the conclusion that the problem before the world was not how to provide a haven of refuge in a tiny territory for the wanderer of all the ages but how to protect the vast and powerful land complex of the Middle East against the danger of invasion from that tiny segment.

Mr. Chairman, the Jewish Agency was greatly heartened by the statements made here by the honorable delegates for the United States of America and for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as by the statements made by many other distinguished delegates. On a number of fundamental points they all spoke in unison and their statements marked an important step towards Jewish statehood. The prospect of agreement between two leading major powers on the issue of Palestine is most encouraging.

The statement of the honorable delegate of the United Kingdom yesterday may or may not have opened slightly a door which his former pronouncement seemed to have practically closed. The Government of the United Kingdom now have a unique chance of helping to conclude honorably a chapter of history which they initiated so nobly through the Balfour Declaration. A great deal of the bitterness of recent years will be forgotten if they take the chance. But the prospect of British cooperation in the solution advocated by two other Great Powers is

still clouded by uncertainty and evil forebodings have not been dispelled.

The implementation of the United Nations decision is admittedly a serious problem. We are most anxious to assist in its solution to the best of our ability in the sub-committee and we shall have practical proposals to make. Here I would make only one observation. The practical difficulty and the international complications which might arise from a new political settlement in Palestine will be smaller and less serious in the event of a United Nations decision than without it. For let it not be assumed that in the latter case trouble would necessarily be localized. It might implicate countries near and far in a chaotic manner. If Britain's decision to withdraw is unconditional and unrelated to United Nations procedure, then a vacuum would ensue. This prospect adds urgency to the problem and aggravates the United Nations responsibility for its effective and timely solution. For us it is a matter of elementary self-preservation to prepare for the eventuality of a vacuum as regards both administration and defense. We pray that in that event a clash may be avoided, but it is our duty to be ready for the worst. We think we shall be.

THE TONE and even the language of most of the speeches of the Arab delegates make it difficult for me to address a word of appeal to them. But let us all

think of the common people in Palestine, Arabs and Jews. Let us think of the common people throughout the Middle East. Let us think of those who meet each other in the fields, who rub shoulders on the railways, who do business together or at least would have liked to do business together. They are all, fundamentally, interested in the same things. They all want bread and work, better living conditions, decent homes, good roads, schools for their children, more efficient communications. Naturally, they all want to see their national cultures flourish, and their peoples secure and independent, sharing in the dignity and happiness which free life and enlightened citizenship can offer. There is strife today. There is fear and there is hatred. But beneath it all, there is an upsurging of common human feeling which is bound to assert itself. The returning Jew passionately believes that he belongs to that country, to that part of the world. He is a returning native. He knows there is room for him there. He has proved it. He does not take room away. He gives. He has a great deal to learn. He has something to teach. He wants equality, nothing more, nothing less—the same opportunity, the same status. His neighbors all have their states. He must have his own Jewish State. Nothing in the world will eradicate from his heart the love of Zion. Nothing will stifle in his soul the urge for freedom in his own land. If he is robbed of his due he will not submit. But he wants peace. He knows that one day he will be understood and accepted as an equal. He prays that day may be near.

Chaim Weizmann:

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN:

One would easily be tempted to follow the previous speaker and attempt to refute so many arguments which are heaped upon us in order to prove his case. But I feel, in thinking about it, that it would take up too much of your time and I propose to take the opportunity some day soon to answer these arguments in writing.

One thing that I would, however, like to say at present, before I enter upon the substance of my statement to you, is that I was rather somewhat amazed to learn that I am not a Jew, that I am a Khazar, a Tartar, a Turk—anything but a Jew. I feel like a Jew, I suffered like a Jew, and I am still a Jew in spite of the previous speaker's argumentation.

Now to come to the subject of what I would like to say.

IT IS A moving experience for me to speak before you—before this great Assembly of the United Nations and outline the purpose and summarize the views and sentiments of the Jewish people at this turning point of their history. My mind goes back something like 26 or 27 years ago when, in the council chamber of the newly-formed League of Nations, a somewhat similar discussion took place and as a result of it there was the solemn endorsement of our programme for the reconstitution of Palestine as our National Home.

I came from the council chamber in which the Mandate was ratified with the feeling that the most cherished ideals of our own people had been sanctioned by the conscience of all mankind. Our ancient civilization which had enriched the thought and spirit of the world was to be given a new—in fact not a new, but a free—abode in the very cradle of its birth. Our people were to find a home—not a refuge, not an asylum, not a mere shelter, but a home with which their past memory and future hope were inseparably bound up. The Jewish people was to fashion its own political and social institutions in the image of its own character and tradition, on a level of equality with all other nations in the human family.

2. I can testify here that the establishment of the Jews as a nation amongst the nations of the world was the real and primary purpose and motive of that international covenant endorsed by the League of Nations. In the light of this knowledge, I cannot fail to be somewhat amused by such frivolous assertions as that made by one of the Arab delegations here to the effect that the motive of the Mandate was to reward *me* for alleged discovery of poison gas. I cannot avoid the conclusion that those who made such rash statements—such assertions—must have been equally unversed with history and particularly elementary chemical literature. I have never either directly or indirectly had anything to do with what is usually called poison gas. It is fantastic.

3. Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: The Mandate was inspired by high purposes, worthy of all the exertion and sacrifice which we could bring. Our achievements in Palestine where our people have created new social and cultural values and opened new economic opportunities for themselves and I believe also for their neighbours were carried out under the sanction of this international treaty. Times have changed; new situations, new conflicts have arisen; and new conditions must now be sought to enable us to fulfill our unique destiny as a nation in Palestine. But I cannot turn to the consideration of these new conditions without paying tribute to the vision, the courage and the universal equity which animated the fifty-two signatories of the Palestine Mandate in enabling our people to approach the threshold of independence, where I believe they are now standing. It is no coincidence that the statesmen who developed the idea of organized international cooperation were prominently identified with the struggle for Jewish national equality as well. Wilson, Balfour, David Lloyd George, Samuel, Smuts and Masaryk and Cecil as well as the leaders in the creation of the United Nations found time, amid their universal preoccupations to plan for the Jewish State.

4. A few months ago in Jerusalem I had the opportunity of meeting your Special Committee and submitting my views on the Palestine question. For several

years I have consistently believed and advocated that the idea of partition, first proposed by the most distinguished and authoritative British Commission on Palestine, represented the only practical compromise which faces the hard facts and offers an escape from deadlock and frustration. It is not an easy compromise to envisage—least of all to one like myself who knows that the original purpose of the Mandate involved no such limitations as is now proposed. Nobody dreamed in those days that the processes of Jewish immigration and of development would have to be confined in an eighth of the area in which the national home was to be established by international consent. All who were identified with the inception of this policy have testified that the vision was wider than that. Before your Special Committee, I brought first-hand evidence to this effect from sources in full acquaintance with what the intentions of the Mandate were—notably that of Balfour, Lloyd George, General Smuts and of President Wilson who declared that a Jewish State was intended.

5. You are now familiar with the considerations which led your Special Committee to recommend, and our own representatives to accept, the principle of a settlement by partition and immigration. I doubt if any political problem has ever been studied by a more judicial and disinterested tribunal. For the most part, the members of the Special Committee and the governments which they represented had no interest or prejudice which could interfere with an objective and dispassionate view. It is not so surprising, therefore, that the majority recommendations are conceived on the most strictly realistic principles. Nor is it surprising that these principles have evoked such widespread and powerful support amongst the delegations represented in this Committee whose sole interest is in a just solution of the problem.

6. The principle of partition has been the subject of such vehement controversy in this Committee that it may be useful and permissible to comment on it briefly at this concluding stage. There is nothing new in the idea of a Jewish State. It is no departure from the Mandate. It is the inevitable and foreseen consummation of the Mandate.

7. Yet I agree with the view of the distinguished Soviet representative that the formal considerations of law and history are secondary at this moment to the considerations of life itself. The main justification, the main necessity for a Jewish State arises from the facts and urgencies of life itself. Consider the position. Here is a community of 700,000 with its language, its religion, its cultural traditions and movements, its dis-

tinctive social outlook, its industrial and agricultural projects, its scientific spirit, its art and its music, its universities and schools. Here, likewise, is a community with a great democratic spirit and a thoroughgoing democratic structure, confronting another group which is in a different stage of development, but is numerically superior. The institutions of the Jewish homeland are in some way distinctive to itself and to the Jewish people of which it is the core. The strongest solidarity of this community is with its kindred in Europe, the battered remnants of ancient communities, survivors who linger amidst the memories of the past and the graveyards of the present.

8. Not one of these characteristics which marks this community is shared by its Arab neighbours. The question before the Assembly is how and by whom shall this Jewish community be governed? By whom shall its development and growth be determined?

9. Shall it be governed by a trustee? By the Arabs? By itself? These three alternatives cover all the variations of Palestinian solutions and the simplest analysis of them must lead this Committee inevitably to the conclusions of the Majority Report.

10. The continuance of a regime of tutelage has been universally discarded by all parties including the Mandatory Power itself. The first recommendation of the Report — the termination of the Mandate — met with considerable approval. And indeed the continuance of this Mandate or of any mandate is hardly a feasible prospect after the declaration by the United Kingdom representative of his Government's intention to plan for an early withdrawal. My own sentiments about the British Mandate are probably no secret to any student of the Palestine question. I sincerely hope that when the Jewish people is secure in its independence the traditional British-Jewish friendship will once again become evident and the present tension will vanish as a passing nightmare. The great services which the British have rendered in helping to lay the foundations of Jewish independence will be remembered with appreciation while the sordid consequences of the White Paper pass into forgetfulness. I have noted with satisfaction the second statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom and am encouraged by the hope that His Majesty's Government will help in the implementation of the recommendation of the United Nations Assembly and so bring to its conclusion a task which Great Britain so nobly began.

11. If we put aside the continuation of any mandate or trusteeship we are left with but two alternatives for

the future government of the Jewish National Home. Either it must be independent, forming a free national unit or it must become and remain a minority under Arab rule, subject in the last resort, to the will of the Arab majority. Mr. Chairman, it is significant that those few delegates who have spoken in this debate against the majority report have also advocated this solution — a Jewish minority in an Arab state. If you deny Jewish statehood, there is no other solution.

12. Now subjection of the Jews as a minority under Arab rule is a solution which all impartial commissions and tribunals have rejected and must reject. On moral grounds it is impossible to take the only community in the world which expresses the national identity of the Jewish people and to place it under the domination of the Arab Higher Committee. It is only that the chairman and members of the Arab Higher Committee — and I don't wish to indulge in personalities—cannot be regarded as having anything but a hostile attitude to Jewish national ideals. The subjection of the Jews as a minority to them is unacceptable in all conditions. Those of us Jews who on the strength of international promise and under the impulsion of our own history made our homes in Palestine did not do so with the object of becoming Arab citizens of Jewish persuasion.

13. I will not discuss whether it is a good or bad fortune to be a minority in an Arab state. I would leave the Jews of Iraq, of Yemen, of Tripoli — and the Christian Assyrians of Iraq—to pronounce upon that. The idea that a national home can ever be equated with a minority position in an Arab state deserves no further consideration at all. It would burst out of such an unnatural framework.

14. It should be obvious by now that a distinct national unit cannot be subjected by force to another nation in the name of majority rule. The distinguished delegate of Canada uttered a profound truth when he said that "unity cannot be imposed without consent." It is in the name of this very principle that my good friend, the distinguished delegate from Pakistan, is here with us today.

15. If we discard the Mandate and emphatically reject minority status in an Arab state, we are left with partition and Jewish statehood as the only possible condition for the future government of Palestine. It is the only solution which promises finality—a clear definition of the limits within which Jew and Arab are free to develop their national wills. Above all it offers equality which is the essential precondition of Arab-Jewish co-operation. When the Jews face the Arabs, as equals, as

equal members of this Assembly, and of the family of nations, only then will the prospect of a real partnership open out. A Jewish State in Palestine will in its own interests, as well as by its own ideals, seek close cooperation with the Arab states on its borders. The majority report in a moving passage refers to the results which can ensue from such equal cooperation between the two Semitic peoples.

16. In the thoughtful declaration which the United States delegate made before this Committee, attention is drawn to the achievement by many Arab peoples of their independence in wide areas. It is appropriate that the question should be viewed in this context of relative equity. The Jews are only claiming in small measure what has been conferred upon the Arabs in abundant degree. There was a time when Arab statesmen were able to see that equity in its true proportions. That was when the eminent leader and liberator of the Arabs, the Emir Feisal, later King of Iraq, made a treaty with me declaring that if the rest of Arab Asia were free, the Arabs would concede the Jewish right freely to settle and develop in Palestine which would exist side by side with the Arab state. My first thought on coming to Palestine in 1918 was to see the Arab leader and to reach such an agreement with him. I shall always be grateful to the British military authority who enabled me to carry out that somewhat hazardous journey into the desert. This agreement was subsequently embodied in the Treaty. The condition which he then stipulated, the independence of all Arab territories outside Palestine, has now been fulfilled. The area of Arab independence stretches from the Euphrates to the Indian Ocean. But independence is not the sole and exclusive right of the Arabs. We Jews also have an equal claim to it. This Assembly cannot possibly decree that the desire of the Arabs to possess an eighth state must obliterate the right of the Jews to possess a single corner where they can live an independent national existence in the land from which they sent a message which became the basis of human civilization.

17. Gentlemen: Despite some of the things that have been said in this debate, I retain my belief in the prospect of Arab-Jewish cooperation once a solution based on finality and equality has received the sanction of international consent. The Jewish State in Palestine may well have a constructive message for its neighbours as well. The smallness of the state will be no bar to its full intellectual achievement. Athens was only one small city and the whole world is still its debtor.

18. Apart from Arab-Jewish cooperation, this solution accomplishes something further as well. It has

profound relevance to the Jewish problem which weighs so heavily upon the conscience of mankind. We were deeply moved to hear the Soviet delegate refer in such eloquent terms to the great tragedy which has befallen our people and which has demonstrated with such frightful emphasis the consequences of its national homelessness. In describing the right of the Jewish people "as of other peoples as well . . . that its security and welfare should not be dependent upon the mercy and good will of this or other states" the Soviet declaration reveals a clear understanding of our deepest historic emotions. This analysis diagnoses our disease as national homelessness and the cure as a home.

19. Now this problem of displaced Jews in Europe and of Jews who may be impelled to seek new homes elsewhere *can* be solved within the framework of the majority report. The Jewish problem in its acute phase today is the problem of about one million or one million and a half Jews in Europe and the Orient who have no assurance of a secure existence. The proposed Jewish State by intensive agriculture and irrigation and by industrial development can provide homes for them all. The industrial development which I have in mind is that which depends not so much on heavy raw materials but on specialized technical skill. Scientific research can do much to expedite the progress of many industries. A well-trained skilled population can do the rest. I have some encouraging personal experience of these possibilities. Switzerland is an instructive example of a flourishing industrial economy with no great access to raw materials but with great resources of skilled manpower. The best raw material of Switzerland is its population.

20. This sort of development together with large schemes of irrigation and land reclamation will solve the Jewish problem in the healthiest way. Life in Palestine offers our people not only a refuge amongst their kinsmen but also a chance of contributing to the rebirth of a nation and the development of its institutions. In this way the new immigrant achieves a unity between himself and the society in which he lives. Our remnants in Europe who have before their eyes six million slaughtered kinsmen cannot stand the thought of another dispersion. They do not throw themselves on the mercy of the world. They are not suppliant, they are not beggars. They wish to be citizens of a Jewish society in which their capacities and ideals will be fully at home. All they wish for is an opportunity and they will do the job themselves. Your Special Committee had a good opportunity of testifying to these assertions in European DP camps.

21. I have nothing to say to those who represent our aims, which I have tried to describe in simple terms, as a sort of dark conspiracy fomented from outside, as a kind of exploitation of misery. It must be remembered that in spite of its smallness Palestine played a very prominent part in salvaging tens of thousands of survivors anxious to leave the furies of hideous memories behind them and become once more honored citizens of their national home. To delude them with exhortations to reconstruct their own graveyards, or to fall as unwanted burdens on the mercy of reluctant powers—this is a mockery of their tragedy and an insult to their very suffering. Therefore, in establishing Jewish equality and nationhood the United Nations can both solve the problem of Palestine's political future and relieve the darkest human tragedy of our time. In bringing so many countries together on bases of agreement, the majority report has already done some service to the cause of international harmony.

22. While supporting the principles of the majority report I would humbly ask the Committee to give new consideration to certain modifications which we have proposed, especially in respect of Western Galilee and the Jewish district of Jerusalem. The proposed economic union is a progressive idea which I believe is bound to triumph over any temporary resistance which it may meet.

23. Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: In reviewing its plans for the implementation of those proposals I would ask this Committee to make full use of the assistance which our own people can give in making the Jewish State capable of its own defense. Undoubtedly, as delegates have said, the Charter itself is the best safeguard of small states against any aggression from its neighbours. We do not anticipate, nor do we fear any such aggression. We find it hard to believe that any states represented here take their international obligations so lightly as to challenge the Assembly's recommendations by the threat or use of force. The Jewish State, when established, will scrupulously observe the Charter's provisions.

We feel, however, that the prospects of peace will be brightest if the Jewish forces maintaining security within our own state are accompanied at the outset by an international force to symbolize the consent and decision of the United Nations. But in all circumstances our people are prepared to make full provision for their own defense.

24. When this Committee comes to plan the creation of a Jewish State, it will be fulfilling a proud

historic mission. Despite its small scope, this enterprise stands high in the esteem of liberal thought. So many considerations of justice and humanity are involved. There is redress for a persecuted people; equality for the Jewish people amongst the nations of the world; the redemption of desert soil by cultivation; the creation of a new economy and society; the embodiment of progressive social ideas in an area that has fallen behind the best standards of modern life; the revival of one of the oldest cultures of mankind.

25. I have been interested and not a little repelled to hear this great enterprise described by the representatives of Iraq and Syria as Nazism. Making due allowance for the legitimate joys of debate, I consider that this carries distortion and libel far indeed. Of course, I do not dispute the right of those two gentlemen to speak with some authority and intimacy on the nature of Nazism. I cannot rival their contacts in that field. But on the nature of Zionism I hold myself a better exponent than they. The character of our movement as a genuine effort at national liberation and society building cannot be obscured by such slanders. Some of them, including absurd allegations about children being snatched from their cradles, are worthy successors of the most atrocious libels in the sordid history of anti-Jewish incitement. No one who invents or gives currency to such statements can

have any reason for pride. On the other hand, I must confess the deep satisfaction that we feel after so many years expent in expounding the ideals of our movement to hear so many impartial and disinterested nations from the old world and the new, from the East and from the West, expressing the spiritual and liberal motives of Zionism with such sympathy and understanding.

26. I cannot allow this statement of the Jewish case to conclude without a word of appeal at this great bar of the world's conscience. A world which does not hear us in this moment of our agony would be deaf to the voice of justice and human feeling which must be raised loud and clear if the moral foundations of our society are to survive. If you follow the impartial judgment of your own qualified Committee and admit us to your table, we shall enter your company with a sense of the spiritual and intellectual challenge which the idea of the United Nations makes to the conscience of man. In giving us this opportunity you will be faithful to the noblest ideals which have been conceived by our ancestors and transmitted by them to the common heritage of the world.

27. "The Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnants of His people. And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcast of Israel and gather together the depressed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."

Issued by

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL

342 Madison Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

